

### Remarks/ARGUMENTS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants have amended their application and respectfully request reconsideration thereof.

#### *Amendment of Claims*

Claims 1, 10, and 12 have been amended to further clarify that attribute information is translated into a canonical representation of the attribute information. The phrase “of the attribute information ” has been added to claim 1 to clarify this aspect. Similar phrases and other limitations from claim 10 have been added to claims 1 and 12.

Claims 12 and 21 have been amended to improve form.

#### *Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,950,173 (hereinafter Perkowski).

Applicants respectfully submits that claims 1-22 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for the reason that Perkowski does not disclose each and every limitation of the claim 10, as amended, of their present application.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

Claim 10 includes the following limitation:

translating attribute information ...into a canonical representation of the attribute information...

The Office Action contends that the above limitation of claim 10 is anticipated by the following disclosure in Perkowski:

Once an "initial" IPI Registrant Database has been constructed using any one or more of the four database construction techniques described hereinabove, manufacturers registered therewith can be periodically contacted using Web-based electronic document (i.e. message) transfer techniques in order to request updating and confirmation of the UPC/URL listings contained within the database of the IPI subsystem of the present invention (emphasis added).

Col. 25, lines 47-54.

The above quote from Perkowski describes updating listings within the IPI Registrant Database. The Office Action reads the above quote to... "describe a procedure where product information, such as the URL, can be updated. In other words, the previous URL is translated into a new URL. The new URL reads as a "canonical representation" (Office Action, page 3).

Claim 10 requires translating attribute information into a canonical representation of the attribute information. Merely for example, attribute information for a portable computer, "laptop", may be translated to the canonical representation,

“notebook” (Application, page 14). In contrast, the above quote from Perkowski does not describe translating; but rather, updating (e.g., an old URL with a new URL). Clearly, the new URL is never “translated” or “change[d] from one form...to another”<sup>1</sup>, but rather is updated or written into the IPI Registrant Database in original form. In addition, the previous URL cannot be said to be translated or “express[ed] in another language, while systematically retaining the original sense”<sup>2</sup>, because the original sense of the previous URL is destroyed when it is overwritten. Moreover, the new URL cannot be read as the canonical representation of the old URL because in no way does the new URL systematically retain the original sense of the old URL (e.g., no translation). Indeed, the above quote explicitly describes a request for “updating” and not translating, much less translating into a canonical representation of the attribute information. Perkowski therefore cannot be said to anticipate the above quoted limitations because Perkowski discloses updating listings in an IPI Registrant Database and claim 10 requires translating attribute information into a canonical representation of the attribute information.

In summary, Perkowski does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 10, as required to support a rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claims 1 and 12 include a limitation corresponding substantially to the above-discussed limitation of claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants request that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Websters II New College Dictionary, Houghton Mifflin Company (1999).

above remarks and amendments contained herein also be considered when examining these other independent claims for allow ability.

As dependent claims are deemed to include all limitation of claims from which they depend, the rejection of claims 2-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102 is also addressed by the above remarks, and the amendments contained herein.

Claim 22 includes the following limitation:

...the value of the token integer corresponds to the location of the start of said character string in the database;

The Office Action contends that the above limitation of claim 22 is anticipated by the following Figure in Perkowski:

IP / SN	REGISTRANT'S NAME	PRODUCT DESCRIPTION	UNIFORM RESOURCE LOCATOR (URL)	TRADE/ SERVICE MARKS	E-MAIL ADDRESS	STATUS
7/18908/17874/0	APPLE COMPUTER, INC. CUPERTINO, CALIF.	POWER MAC. 7800/120 PERSONAL COMPUTER	http://www.-----/	POWER MAC.		
0/373/100/6	PROCTOR & GAMBLE	TOOTH PASTE	http://www.-----/	CREST		
3/12547/68404/0	WARNER WELCOME	ACID REDUCER	http://www.-----/	ZANTAC, ZANTAC 75		
0/00005/17843/4	KODAK, INC.	FILM PROCESSING	http://www.-----/	KODAK		
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
0/27242/61057/9	SONY, INC.	PERSONAL COMPUTER	http://www.sony.com/pc	SONY		

FIG 4A1

---

<sup>2</sup> Id. (an alternate definition).

Perkowski discloses the following:

As shown in FIG. 4A1, the ... IPI Registrant Database... comprises a ... an IPN Information Field for storing information (e.g. numeric or alphanumeric string) representative of the Universal Product Number (e.g. twelve-digit UPC Version A number or eight-digit UPC Version E number) assigned to the consumer product.

Col. 18, lines 33-40.

Specifically, the Office Action states:

"that the numbers for the "IP/SN" are token integers associated directly with specific character strings. For example, in FIG. 4A1, the token integer "0/373/100/6" is associated with the character string "Tooth Paste". The particular IP/SN is assigned to and associated with Tooth Paste.

Office Action, Pages 5-6.

Claim 22 requires a token integer to correspond to a location of the start of the character string in a database. In contrast, the above Figure does not disclose a token integer that corresponds to the location of the start of a character string in a database; but rather, a Universal Product Number (UPN). The Office Action indicates, the UPN, "0/373/100/6", is associated with "Tooth Paste". Nevertheless, the UPN, "0/373/100/6", cannot be said to correspond to the location of the start of a character string because a UPN is a number that conforms to an industry standard numbering system (Col. 1, line 46) that is assigned by a manufacturer (Col. 1, line 53) and is therefore unrelated to the location of the character string, much less the start of the character string. Perkowski therefore cannot be said to anticipate the above quoted limitations because Perkowski

discloses a Universal Product Number and claim 22 requires a token integer to correspond to the location of the start of the character string in a database.

In summary, Applicants believe that all rejections presented in the Office Action have been fully addressed and withdrawn of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicants furthermore believe that all claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Mark Vatuone at (408) 947-8200.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 5/28, 2004



Mark R. Vatuone  
Reg. No. 53,719

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 947-8200